UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/686,124	10/14/2003	Scott Jon Benjamin	EA-00046D2	7619

7590 05/05/2005

Kevin W. Cyr
Lockheed Martin Corporation
MS U2F26
3333 Pilot Knob Road
Eagan, MN 55121-2034

EXAMINER	
TRUONG, CAM Y T	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2162	

DATE MAILED: 05/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	**Application No.** 10/686,124	**Applicant(s)** BENJAMIN ET AL.
	Examiner Cam Y T Truong	**Art Unit** 2162

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE ____ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-11* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-11* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant has canceled claims 12-22 in the preliminary amendment. Claims 1-11 are pending in this Office Action.

Double Patenting

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington,* 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claim 1 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No.6662179.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other.

The application claim 1 recites similar limitations in the patent claim 1, such as:

Claim 1 of the application is directed to:

"at least one each of a parts information lookup table, a location information lookup table, a unit storage table, (a) said location information lookup tables provide a list of available locations to place a part in a unit of manufacture, and further comprise a location definition lookup table, and (b) said parts information lookup tables provide a catalog of parts and further comprise a parts list lookup table used to identify each part, and (c) a set of parameter information lookup tables related to said parts list lookup table for defining any number of parameters of information unique to each part, comprised of a parameter definition lookup table defining a list of said parameters for each part, which is related to a parameter list lookup table which defines a list of parameters that may be associated with any part in said parts list table; and (d) said unit storage tables provide the configuration of a unit of manufacture comprising: (i) a unit definition storage table, which is related to said location information lookup table to identify a specific unit of manufacture, and (ii) a unit parts list storage table, which is related to one or more of said parts in said parts list information lookup tables to provide a list of parts for each said unit of manufacture, where each part in said unit parts list storage table is assigned a location from said location definition lookup table, and (iii) a unit parameter list storage table, which is used to record configuration parameter values for each part in said unit of manufacture, which is related to both said unit parts list storage table and said parameter definition lookup table".

The patent claim 1 recites different specific limitations in the application claim 1 such as:

Claim 1 of the patent is directed to:

"a pair of configuration management storage tables, wherein said pair of configuration management storage tables are linked together, and one of said configuration management storage tables of said pair of linked configuration management storage tables is a configuration management status table and the other is a configuration management memo table; comprising accessing both of said linked configuration management storage tables by using a first index key, which defines a group of configuration management records for a part definition, location definition, or unit definition, and a second configuration management index key which defines the current configuration management records for a part definition, location definition, or unit location".

The application claim 1 does not contain specific limitations as shown in the patent claim 1; however, according to In re Goodman, the application claim 4 is generic to the species of information covered by claim 1 of the patent. Thus, the generic invention is anticipated by the species of the patented invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knoblock et al (USP 6023699) in view of Jernigan (USP 5210686).

As to claim 1, Knoblock teaches the claimed limitations:

"at least one each of a parts information lookup table, a location information lookup table, and a unit storage table wherein: said location information lookup tables provide a list of available locations to place a part in a unit of manufacture and further comprise a location definition lookup table" as (col. 3, lines 50-60; col. 9, lines 55-67; col. 22, lines 20-40), "said parts information lookup tables provide a catalog of parts and further comprise a parts list lookup table used to identify each part" as (col. 9, lines 45-55; col. 22, lines 20-40), "a unit parts list storage table, which is related to one or more of said parts in said parts list information lookup tables to provide a list of parts for each said unit of manufacture, where each part in said unit parts list storage table is assigned a location from said location definition lookup table" as (col. 12, lines 20-67);

"said unit storage tables provide the configuration of a unit of manufacture comprising: a unit definition storage table, which is related to said location information lookup table to identify a specific unit of manufacture" as (col. 13, lines 30-60);

"a unit parameter list storage table, which is used to record configuration parameter values for each part in said unit of manufacture, which is related to both said unit parts list storage table and said parameter definition lookup table" as (col. 13, lines 30-60).

Knoblock fails to teach the claimed limitation "a set of parameter information lookup tables related to said parts list lookup table for defining any number of parameters of information unique to each part comprised of parameter definition lookup table defining a list of said parameters for each part, which is related to a parameter list lookup table which defines a list of parameters that may be associated with any part in said parts list table". However, Jernigan teaches the item number is placed in the first field of the explosion control table 36 and is used as the key to index into the bill of material components data file 44 and move to a deeper level of the bill of material. The bill of material level is placed in the second field of the explosion control table 36 and represents the current component level within the bill of material explosion, i.e., the value in the current level counter incremented by one. The purpose of this field is to enable quick discarding of a component of an assembly when completely exploded and to determine the next item to explode when moving back up the bill of material. As each component is retrieved, it is assigned an increasing component sequence number starting with the number one. The component sequence number is placed in the third field of the explosion control table 36. The component sequence number field takes the place of the cursor and, together with the bill of material level, enables direct retrieval of the next item. This information shows that each of item number in control table is a unique number to identify for each item in the bill of material components data file 44. Each of item number is represent a parameter information or a set of item numbers are presented as a set parameter information (col. 3, lines 105-65).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Jernigan's teaching of the item number is placed in the first field of the explosion control table 36 and is used as the key to index into the bill of material components data file 44 and move to a deeper level of the bill of material. The bill of material level is placed in the second field of the explosion control table 36 and represents the current component level within the bill of material explosion, i.e., the value in the current level counter incremented by one. The purpose of this field is to enable quick discarding of a component of an assembly when completely exploded and to determine the next item to explode when moving back up the bill of material. As each component is retrieved, it is assigned an increasing component sequence number starting with the number one. The component sequence number is placed in the third field of the explosion control table 36. The component sequence number field takes the place of the cursor and, together with the bill of material level, enables direct retrieval of the next item to Knoblock's system in order to allow a user to identify and build a particular equipment following user's desire.

As to claim 2, Knoblock teaches the claimed limitation "wherein said location definition lookup table is related to apart family definition lookup table which is related to said parts list lookup table for identifying which parts are compatible with each location of said location definition" as (fig. 10J-10K).

As to claim 3, Knoblock teaches the claimed limitation "wherein said location definition lookup table is related to an equipment type definition lookup table for identifying any number of different types of units of manufacture" as (col. 12, lines 25-67).

As to claim 4, Knoblock teaches the claimed limitation "wherein said location definition lookup table is related to a location description lookup table for defining one, or more locations for a type of unit of manufacture" as (col. 12, lines 40-60).

As to claim 5, Knoblock teaches the claimed limitation "wherein said parts list lookup table is related to a part type lookup table for grouping said parts into part categories" as (col. 13, lines 45-60).

As to claim 6, Knoblock teaches the claimed limitation "wherein said parts in said parts list lookup table are related to a kit definition lookup table for grouping said parts into kits" as (col. 20, lines 25-67).

As to claim 7, Knoblock teaches the claimed limitation “wherein said unit parts list storage table is related to a processor group storage table for grouping parts associated with a processor” as (col. 22, lines 40-67).

As to claim 8, Knoblock teaches the claimed limitation “an interface definition lookup table and a unit interconnect storage table, wherein said parts list lookup table is related to said interface definition lookup table for defining interfaces unique to a part in the parts list, and said unit parts list storage table is related to said unit interconnect storage table, which is related to said interface definition lookup table for defining connections between parts in said unit parts list” as (col. 17, lines 15-50).

As to claim 9, Knoblock teaches the claimed limitation “wherein said interface definition lookup table is related to an interface family lookup table for identifying compatible mating connections of said parts” as (col. 17, lines 15-50).

As to claim 10, Knoblock teaches the claimed limitation “wherein said parameter list lookup table is related to a parameter group definition lookup table for grouping said parameters into parameter categories” as (col. 3, lines 15-50).

As to claim 11, Knoblock teaches the claimed limitation wherein said parameter list lookup table is related to a parameter description look up table for defining multiple groups of parameters, which allow multiple pre-defined configurations of a part" as (col. 17, lines 15-50; col. 3, lines 15-50).

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Fisher et al (USP 6226711).

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cam Y T Truong whose telephone number is (571) 272-4042. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Firday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Cam Y T Truong
Examiner
Art Unit 2162

4/29/2005